



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

5

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/328,931 06/09/99 MORRIS

D TES-7356-003

┌

QM01/0609

TIMOTHY E. SIEGEL, PATENT ATTORNEY
5125 SW MACADAM AVENUE, SUITE 200
PORTLAND OR 97201

└

EXAMINER

VERDIER, C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3745

9

DATE MAILED:
06/09/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/328,931

Applicant(s)
Morris

Examiner
Christopher Verdier

Group Art Unit
3745



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Christopher Verdier

(3) _____

(2) Timothy Siegel

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jun 7, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 2

Identification of prior art discussed:

Wallace, Wilford, and Kingsbury (all in general terms)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant's Attorney argued that claim 1, lines 5-7 which recite the rotatable blades that sweep out the shape of the virtual disk having the properties of a lifting body should be interpreted that the blades pushing translationally through the air cause the lift, and that the rotation of the blades does not cause the lift. This helpful argument points to what applicant regards as the invention. The examiner explained that claims are to be given their broadest reasonable interpretation and that limitations from the specification are not to be read into the claims. In response, Applicant's Attorney requested that an amendment after final be entered which recites that the blades pushing translationally through the air cause the lift. The examiner indicated that this proposed amendment could not be entered because it raises new issues that would require further search and consideration. Concerning a request that the finality be withdrawn so that Applicant may claim such features, the examiner explained that USPTO policy of compact prosecution prevents this.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

CHRISTOPHER VERDIER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3745

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.